

The Faith and Free Press

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 82
HIGH POINT
N. C.

Vol. 13
September

Published monthly in the interest of
the historic faith and freedom of Southern Baptists

No. 9
1957

PROMINENT SOUTHERN BAPTIST PASTOR PROTESTS

The Rev. Alvin G. Hause, pastor of Bales Baptist Church, Kansas City, Missouri, wrote the editor of this paper on August 8 as follows:

"I am sending you a carbon copy of an article I am mailing today to Editor McGinty of the Missouri WORD AND WAY with the permission if you desire to publish same in your paper.

"I do not know whether Brother McGinty will publish this article or not, although he has never yet turned down an article I have sent to him, but I did want you to know how I felt about your article in the July issue of THE FAITH AND FREE PRESS entitled: 'The "Wrong Count" Convention'.

"You no doubt have every reason to feel as you do about the way your proposed constitutional amendment was handled in the recent Chicago convention, and although I would have voted against the amendment if I had been present, by every usage of parliamentary practice the amendment should have been on the order of business as such and should have been an item in the agenda on the second day of the Convention.

"As Moderator of our Kansas City Baptist Association for some years I am sure that you are right in your written protest as to the way the matter was handled. I think it was a serious error and a grievous mistake on the part of those in charge of the proceedings and I also believe that they owe you and those of like mind in our Convention an apology for the sake of Christian spirit and denominational unity."

The article which the Rev. Mr. Hause enclosed was entitled, "Is Our Baptist Democracy Going—Going—? ? ?" The complete article is as follows:

"After being a Pastor for forty-three years, forty of them in Kansas City, Missouri, I am wondering if certain signs and tendencies do not point to *the danger that we are as a denomination losing our democracy* which for these many years has been one of our most cherished doctrines.

"It is apparent that this is true from the Southern Convention level to the local church itself.

"What happened in Chicago at the last Southern Baptist Convention is a clear sign of this fact. I take the little monthly paper 'THE FAITH AND FREE PRESS' not because I agree with everything I read in it nor with the editor's views as expressed from month to month but in the July issue I do believe that Editor James M. Bulman has reasons to question the wisdom and the motive of the Committee on Order of Business relative to the serious blunder of that committee and the Convention's officials in not placing the proposed amendment to the constitution on the program as a matter of referred business from the Kansas City Convention. When Rev. Bulman says: '*The proposed amendment had been read at last year's Convention; and, therefore, according to the requirement of the constitution, would seem to be a matter automatically sched-*

James M. Bulman,
Editor

I. W. Rogers,
Associate Editor

The Faith and Free Press

Subscription Rate:

\$2.00 per year

\$5.00 for three years

Official Organ of the "COMMITTEE FOR BAPTIST CHURCH AUTONOMY, INC."

Security Bank Building, High Point, N. C.

"I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." Jude 3. (ASV.)

"Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Galatians 5:1 (A.V.)

uled to be placed on the agenda of this year's Convention', he is entirely correct. When Mr. Bulman was told that the matter could be considered during a 'miscellaneous business' period and since but one period of miscellaneous business had been allotted by the second day of the Convention, is not Mr. Bulman right in saying: 'the amendment was obviously placed in jeopardy'?

"Now, if I had been present at the Convention in Chicago I would have voted against the amendment because I believe, as did the majority of the Convention Messengers, that it was unnecessary in light of the pronouncement made by the Convention in 1928 on 'Relation of Southern Baptist Convention to Other Baptist Bodies', but the treatment of the proposed amendment by the Convention in Chicago, in not following the usual parliamentary practice, gives those in the Convention who are in the minority the chance to do just what is now being done by Editor Bulman in his 'The Faith and Free Press.'

"This is the dangerous tendency that many of us see in our denominational life today. **It not only is prevalent in the Convention itself but goes down to the District Association level and even to the local Baptist church. Some denominational leaders and State and Associational officers seem to have the idea that if one in the ranks questions their judgment or expresses an opinion in variance to their own, that this person is un-cooperative and not a good Baptist.**

"Being a cooperative Southern Baptist and since our church is among the highest in our State in gifts to the cooperative program. I think I can say this without being branded a non-cooperative Pastor.

"In many of our Boards and Committees if a member differs with and expresses himself from deep conviction contrary to the leaders and officials many times he is dropped from the Board or committee and is no longer used in the denomination. This is so true, that many laymen have told me that they fear to express themselves in their own churches

because their Pastor takes it as a personal affront and seeks to un-frock them from their position.

"As I understand our Baptist democracy every member of every Baptist church and of every Baptist Convention and of every Baptist Board and committee not only has the right but has the responsibility of giving his conviction and judgment on any question before the body without fear of being deposed or marked as a dissident member and Baptist.

"Whenever the Baptist majority in any Baptist organization, whether it be a local church or an Association or the Convention itself tries by parliamentary manipulations or 'hotel room' strategy, to keep silent a minority who desire to be heard, then *our cherished Baptist democracy is threatened. As a matter of fact, it is going, going, and if not checked, soon will be gone.*

"Trying to force those who differ with us, instead of seeking to convince them of our correct position only causes dissension and the lack of unity among God's people.

"I believe in the cooperative program with all my heart but trying to force those who do not believe in it as I do only causes an increasing amount of denominational contributions to be designated year by year. Do not our leaders see the danger and the reason why in 1957 it was reported that there was \$4,553,724.77 DESIGNATED whereas in 1956 it was reported that there were \$3,980,697.44 designated cooperative receipts. Year by year we see the column marked DESIGNATED grow and the one called COOPERATIVE PROGRAM decline in the amount received by our Convention and yet we make no attempt to correct the situation. **If the present practice of designations continues we will not have a cooperative program and then we will have to go back to the many, many, financial appeals made in our churches for the support of our work instead of the unified budget and the cooperative program, which I think is of God and is the right method to use in supporting all of our work.**

"But trying to FORCE our Pastors and our churches to give un-designated to the cooperative program only stiffens opposition and causes dissension among us.

"Brethren—I appeal to every leader, whether in the local church or the Southern Baptist Convention—let us invite those who differ with us to air their convictions and even their grievances and I am sure we will 'win friends and influence people' to our way of thinking, if, IF, we are right, and you know we MAY BE wrong. I know no Pastor, denominational secretary, Convention leader, on anyone else who is perfect and who makes no mistakes either in thought or in practice.

"Let us guard with our lives and our fortunes too, *Baptist democracy* and the *local church autonomy*, since both have made us what we are and will keep us what we should ever be." (emphasis supplied by italics and bold face type)

WHAT IS MEANT BY "SCRIPTURAL"?—

The word "scriptural" is frequently used, especially by people who believe the Bible. But, how many of us have in mind a clear-cut definition of the word when we use it? Few dictionaries have an adequate definition, probably because of the fact that dictionaries are written by people who do very little thinking along religious lines. Conscious of my own limitations, but realizing that some of us should do some real thinking on the meaning of this word, I am hereby offering what I believe to be an adequate definition of the term, "scriptural".

1. Any doctrine or practice is scriptural if it is plainly commanded or taught in the Scriptures.

2. Any doctrine or practice is scriptural if an example, or examples, of it are found in the Scriptures which are clearly intended to be illustrations of what ought to be believed or done.

3. Any practice is scriptural if it is necessary that it be done in order to carry out a command or teaching of the Scriptures.

Surely, every Bible believer will agree that the first statement in our definition is correct. If the Lord has given a command which is applicable to us, surely we ought to do what He commanded without questioning or murmuring. If a principle or doctrine is clearly taught in the Scriptures, we ought to accept it and believe it and make it a part of our lives,

without any quibbling. Some of the things that the Lord commanded are not reasonable from the standpoint of the world, and the servants of the Lord who obey them are considered foolish, by worldlings. But, is that any reason why we should not obey these commands?

Regarding the second statement in our definition, let it be said that the Bible gives us many examples which should *not* be followed, and many others which *should* be followed. So, it is up to us to discern between the examples that we should follow and those we should reject. There is one perfect example which every individual should follow, and that is Jesus. In 1 Peter, chapter two, the apostle tells of the sufferings of Jesus, in which he declared: "For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow in his steps." But, how many of us are following Jesus closely enough that we are made to suffer for it? For instance, a substantial per cent of Southern Baptists seem perfectly satisfied with tithing as a standard of giving. But there is no suffering in tithing, and many self-satisfied tithers are badly backslidden. But if they were following the New Testament plan of giving, it would mean sacrifice and suffering. Our Lord commended the widow who gave two mites, not because she tithed, but because she gave "all her living." Paul commended the churches of Macedonia, not because they tithed, but because they gave beyond their ability, and "abounded" in the grace of giving. But no servant of Christ in the New Testament was commended for tithing, for the simple reason that the New Testament way of giving is the way of suffering and sacrifice.

Again, on the second statement, the churches of the New Testament set examples of wrong-doing in some instances; but in others, it is evident that the Lord has told us of their activities in order to give the churches of succeeding times examples of how they ought to conduct themselves in trying to serve the Lord. For instance, when the churches of Macedonia, under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, became convinced that they ought to help the poor Christians in Judea who were suffering on account of a famine, then these churches took a *designated offering* for this particular purpose and sent it for the relief of these poor people by the hands of Paul, and others who were elected to travel with Paul, in order to see to it that the money went to the object for which it was designated. That was the kind of cooperative

program, and the only kind, that the churches of the New Testament practiced—*cooperating together in making a designated offering for one particular purpose*. And, it is easy to see that all who gave to this offering knew exactly the object to which they were giving. Anyone who knows anything about it, knows that this is not true concerning givers to the Cooperative Program of Southern Baptists. And, what was true of their offerings to the poor was also true of the offerings for the spread of the Gospel. When Paul had crossed over into Europe and had established the church at Philippi and had gone on to work at other places, this Philippian church was the only one that supported him for a while; but later on other churches joined in this cooperative program of giving to one particular object—the support of the great missionary, Paul, as he went on winning the lost, establishing churches, and indoctrinating them. Every one of the offerings of New Testament churches for the support of the poor and for the spread of the Gospel were **designated offerings**, and were based on the wisdom of God; whereas, the Southern Baptist Cooperative Program is a plan based on the wisdom of men for making **undesignated offerings**. The reason we have this Southern Baptist Program is that a small group of men, under pressure, were persuaded to substantiate their own program for God's program as it is plainly given in the Scriptures. In other words, they put up their wisdom as better than the wisdom of God. No wonder the Southern Baptist Cooperative Program is a terrible mess! Moreover, in conducting God's cooperative program, New Testament church members were in position to pray about how much to give to each designated object. But how much praying is done about the man-made plan called the Cooperative Program? They are not even asked by the denominational leaders to pray about it! However, one dear brother—Editor E. S. James of the *Baptist Standard*—did ask his readers, after they have made their offerings to the Cooperative Program, to “pray that God may lead the responsible parties to allocate it where it is most greatly needed.” That smacks of Roman Catholicism—turning everything over to the priest, and praying that he will do the right thing about it, because forsooth, they, the people, are too ignorant to do what is right about it! So, we have the Southern Baptist Executive Committee “priests”, far removed from the individual Baptist members, acting for these members, and thus removing

the responsibility of these individual members as to what objects the Lord's money entrusted to them should be used in supporting! Can you beat it? I can, and here is how—**give to God's cooperative program, as plainly laid down in the Scriptures! Give the amount, and to the objects, as He directs!**

Regarding the third statement in our definition of “scriptural”, there seems to be some things that are absolutely necessary to be done in order to obey the commands of our Lord as given in the New Testament, but He has not seen fit to tell us how to do these things. For instance, the Scriptures tell us to not forsake the assembling of ourselves together; Heb. 10:25. That is a command to go to church. But the Lord did not tell us what mode of travel to use in getting there. However, it is absolutely necessary that we use **some method of travel** in obeying this command. Also, if we are going to assemble ourselves together, there must be a **place of meeting**. There were no church buildings in New Testament days, and churches met in homes, schools, in the open, etc. Many homes in Bible lands were so built, and the climate was such, that they were convenient places for small churches to meet. But we do not build our homes in America that way today. But, it is necessary for a church to have a suitable place to meet. So, the logical thing, and the necessary thing for most churches seems to be to provide a place of worship by constructing a church building of their own, or by purchasing one already built. So, church buildings are scriptural. In this same category is the Sunday School. Before our Lord went back to heaven he commanded his church to teach the things he had commanded the apostles to teach. But He did *not* outline a *plan* by which the churches should do this. About the only thing the Scriptures tell us concerning this matter is that the teaching is to be done by both men and women. (See 2 Tim. 2:2, the word for “men” meaning **mankind**, or people of both sexes.) But, since the Lord did not give us a plan for teaching his word, it is up to the churches to work out the best plan they can to teach His word to the people of all ages who attend their services, taking care always to avoid violating any and all instructions to the churches in the New Testament. Let it be said, in this connection, that there are many things about many Sunday Schools that are unscriptural. For instance, it is unscriptural to substitute a quarterly for the Bible as the text-book of the Sunday School.

But the Sunday School principle is scriptural. There are a number of other things which could be mentioned under this part of our definition, but these are sufficient to illustrate the principle.

The problems connected with doing what is scriptural are not difficult to solve, provided we are, first of all, entirely willing to do the Lord's will, and are determined that the word of God will be our only rule of faith and practice. Let us see to it that all our teachings and practices are *scriptural*!

(I. W. R.)

WHAT READERS ARE SAYING

From KENTUCKY: "More than twenty years ago I did what Brother Rand only recently did. I left the Convention, but not without every possible effort to make my fight for the very principles for which you brethren are now fighting, and to make it on the inside. It came to where I was repeatedly refused admission to the floor in our State Convention. Your account of your experience at the recent Southern Baptist Convention is but a repeat of the history of some of my own experiences in the State Convention many years ago."

From CALIFORNIA: "I makes me sick to see how Southern Baptists are going modernistic. No wonder so many Baptist Bible churches are springing up all around."

From ALABAMA: "The July issue of your paper is a masterpiece."

From VIRGINIA: "I am a Southern Baptist, having been raised in a Baptist church, but am a Baptist by conviction and choice. I am opposed to liquor, dancing, etc., and speak out against such with conviction and I do not consider myself a fanatic when I do."

"I notice you are very strong in what you say in print and quote certain people, but some not to the full, only as reported. Can you pin any of these statements down as authentic? For instance . . . you say: 'It was reported in this interview that President Tribble was asked about the trustees' action and that he expressed his approval of what the trustees had done—his argument being that the Christian approach should not be negative.' Also it was reported in this interview that Dr. C. C. Warren, a member of the board of trustees, was asked about the matter. It was reported that he said that all of the ministers who are trustees were out of the room when the vote was taken on the question.' Now, sir, do you actually know that these statements are true or is this hearsay? (Editor's comment: the editor did not hear with his own ears such statements from the mouths of Doctors Tribble and Warren. Nor was any such claim made as to the source of information. What was stated in our July issue was that the information was obtained from what was reported to the editor in an interview with three Wake Forest ministerial students. The editor knows one of these three students and has a very high regard for the student's honesty and integrity.

Furthermore, it was clearly stated in our July issue that we are offering to Doctors Tribble and Warren the opportunity for them to give their side of the matter if they feel that this paper has not correctly represented their viewpoint. As yet we have received no statement from anybody attempting to show that what was reported in this paper is not correct.)

"Then in the column, 'What Readers Are Saying,' you quote from a letter by a Wake Forest student as follows: 'The battle over dancing is raging, etc.—In chapel this last Tuesday a rope dropped down and a . . . ' you say that there was attached an 'object' which you did not care to mention. Now who saw this object, and if you are opposing such things why can't you mention the object that hung on the rope? Are you ashamed of the object and if so why not tell your readers about it? (Editor's comment: As to who "saw" the object, the Wake Forest student who wrote the letter alleges that he saw it. The editor of this paper was not present in that chapel service. However, that such an object was displayed was confirmed in the above-mentioned interview with the three Wake Forest students. Nor have we received any word from anyone denying this. As to whether or not the editor is "ashamed" of the object, it may be stated strongly that we would most assuredly be ashamed for such an object to be displayed in a chapel service on a Christian campus. There are many things to which we are opposed which we do not feel appropriate to be mentioned pointedly in this magazine. We do not intend to lower the standard of this magazine.)

"I was present at the Convention in Kansas City when you sought the floor and you were voted down. I was not present at Chicago but hope to be present at Houston next year. I believe a messenger has a right to be heard on any matter that concerns the Convention whether he be right or wrong."

From the Denominational Press

THE ALABAMA BAPTIST recently ran an article that is quite unusual for Baptist state papers in this day and age. The article was written by Dr. L. E. Barton, well known as the author of the constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention. Dr. Barton is much concerned with the preservation of Baptist democracy. As was brought out in the July issue of *The Faith and Free Press*, Dr. Barton spoke out vigorously at the recent Chicago convention against the changes in the by-laws adopted by the convention in response to the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Dr. Barton's article in the Alabama paper is a reply to an editorial of July 4. Speaking directly concerning this editorial but with evident application to what is in many Baptist circles fast becoming accepted procedure, Dr. Barton labeled as "Presbyterian" the form of government that is actually being practiced. This "Prsebyterian" form of government he characterized as advocating: "let the Session, Synod, and Presbytery rule and the people pay the money and be silent." He said in criticism of this "Presbyterian doctrine":

"But that breaks with the time honored and, we believe, the Scriptural teaching of Baptists. It junks the doctrine of the American Revolution that taxation confers the right of representation and control.

"Second, this doctrine assumes that some of the people (the committees) know more than all the people. That never is true. All the people know more than some of the people."

Dr. Barton related some interesting "inside information"—such as the following item:

"I know the following is true for a member of the Executive Committee who was present and heard the conversation told me: During an Executive Committee meeting four members were eating lunch together at one table, and one of them said: 'Right here at this table is where the policies of the SBC are made.' And the truth is that he was correct."

And this item:

"Perhaps the cleverest man in the Convention, who heads an institution that has more influence probably than any other one, wrote me recently that I was absolutely right in opposing the Executive Committee about the changes in the By-Laws at Chicago. Then he added in substance 'But the Baptists will wake up some day and blow off and reassert their right of free discussion.'"

The concluding part of his article is as follows:

"If the Executive Committee must meddle with the rules I suggest that they curtail some of their own excessive power—a thing that never happens with committees, therefore the necessity for the Convention to assert its authority instead of surrendering to the domination of committees. If the Convention is going to be free it will have to make its agencies understand that it is 'boss of its own boats,' and the Executive Committee is the place where it will have to begin.

"... the attendance at Chicago was two thousand under several meetings in recent years. Maybe the folks are not as well pleased as you might think with Presbyterian government. An influential pastor in Virginia wrote me years ago that after some 35 years he had become so 'fed up' with the suppression of free discussion that he never intended to attend another meeting of the SBC, and I have not seen him there since. I shall bear my testimony though the heavens fall to the right of Baptists to control their own affairs, and not be sub-

servient to their agencies. A vigorous Texas church has just voted to withhold its contributions because of the procedure of our convention agency on a current question. One of the older churches here in Montgomery has taken some similar action. Baptists don't work well in blind bridles."

On July 15 Dr. M. A. Huggins completed his 25th year as general secretary of the N. C. Baptist State Convention. In addition to an editorial in praise of Dr. Huggins, the July 27th issue of the *Biblical Recorder* ran the following in an article by promotional secretary Earl L. Bradley:

"When the Baptist State Convention convened in 1932, many important decisions had to be made. Among them was the election of a general secretary. The messengers of the convention realized the importance of selecting a leader who was *consecrated* and one who *possessed wisdom* and who *had the confidence of the people* . . .

"Finally . . . a tall, lean, gray-haired man who had been called from the intellectual cloister of the University of North Carolina as acting general secretary was elected. M. A. Huggins accepted, realizing that the convention receipts were at the lowest ebb, our institutions were in debt, and the convention, as such owned no property. There was an outstanding indebtedness of \$764,000. The income from the Cooperative Program was \$199,929.02. The designated gifts amounted to \$95,975.69.

"Soon after accepting the position of general secretary, Dr. Huggins launched a daring program for paying the debt and for increasing gifts through the Cooperative Program. No man has ever given himself more whole-heartedly to his task. Eternity alone will reveal the long hours spent and the miles traveled pleading, urging and challenging the people. The people and the churches began to respond, until in 1956 the gifts for the Cooperative Program amounted to \$2,841,812.26. Gifts designated for missions amounted to \$1,230,196.21, making a total of \$4,072,008.67. The property now owned by the Baptist State Convention amounts to \$1,080,323.52 . . .

"Through all this growth M. A. Huggins has remained *the same quiet, unassuming, consecrated and dedicated leader*. 'And when the smoke of the battle and the din of the cannon had ceased—and men are able to give a calm and clear perspective of the achievements' of this generation, *Baptists for all time to come will rise up and call him blessed*. They will give thanks to God for his long and faithful leadership because he has crossed our paths and left his footprints on the sands of our time" (emphasis supplied).

When in Mayfield, Kentucky, Visit

STONE'S DRUG STORE

8th and Broadway

For Every Drug Need

Up or Down?

FURTHER COMPLICATIONS CONCERNING N. C. BAPTIST FINANCES

The *Biblical Recorder* reported the following in its recent July 27th issue:

"North Carolina Baptist gifts to the Southern Baptist Convention are running ahead of the first six months of 1956, despite the fact that the state's Cooperative Program gifts have fallen short, Porter Routh, treasurer, has announced. . . . Cooperative Program gifts . . . have decreased from \$511,323 to \$439,103" (emphasis supplied).

However, in reporting the recent semiannual meeting of the General Board of the N. C. Baptist State Convention, the August 3rd issue of the *Biblical Recorder* stated:

"Controller Leon Spencer gave a report on the income and expenses of the Convention for the first six months of 1957. According to his report, receipts for the Cooperative Program are five per cent higher than for the same period of 1956" (emphasis supplied).

Then, in the August 10th issue of the *Biblical Recorder*, Dr. M. A. Huggins sought to explain the present confusion by showing that, according to the pace at which N. C. Baptists are moving now, Cooperative Program gifts to the Southern Convention actually will amount to more for the whole year as compared with last year, in spite of the fact that "the Southern Convention is receiving relatively less during the first part of the year" than was the case last year. Dr. Huggins explained the present decrease as due to a change in procedure in sending money to the Southern Convention. His complete article is as follows:

"Articles have appeared recently in both the *BIBLICAL RECORDER* and *CHARITY AND CHILDREN* pointing out that for the year 1957 North Carolina is greatly behind in the support of the Cooperative Program.

"I write this brief article in explanation of the actual figures given.

"As a matter of fact, when we consider the whole year 1957 we are not behind but ahead. The difference is due to the fact that prior to 1957 the Southern Baptist Convention received a certain amount in dollars during the first part of the year, as did other objects sharing in the Cooperative Program. Then after the amount set up in terms of dollars had been met, the State Convention objects received 75% of the remainder and Southern Convention objects received 25%. This set-up was changed with the beginning of 1957, and the Southern Baptist Convention is receiving 40% straight through the year. As a matter of fact, therefore, while the Southern Convention is receiving relatively less during the first part of the year under the present set-up, the objects of

the Southern Convention will be receiving 40% instead of 25% when we come to the last four or five months of the year. Therefore, as of the end of the year, if we continue the same advance we are now making, the objects of the Southern Convention will receive in 1957 some 10% more than in 1956."

Before considering Dr. Huggins' explanation of the situation, we feel that it is appropriate to recall what he said, under oath, in explanation of what he had written years before about the autonomy of the local church. In a book entitled, *North Carolina for Christ*, he had written: "When, therefore, these churches joined forces they did not surrender, and do not now surrender, any of their autonomy" (p. 65). Yet, while giving testimony in a court case actually involving the right of a local church to exercise its autonomy by withdrawing support of the Southern Convention, Dr. Huggins said of this statement which he had previously written, "I did not mean what I said when I wrote that" (Supreme Court of North Carolina, No. 95, Second District, Fall Term, 1954, p. 147, emphasis supplied). . . . And we feel that it is well to refer to something that has been written by Attorney William C. Lassiter regarding the Baptist leaders who repudiated in court certain of their previous affirmations of local church autonomy. Mr. Lassiter remarked that, when writers of books repudiate in court basic statements in those books, it seems obvious that we would do well to take "with a grain of salt" what they have to say in their published statements "and await another court hearing to obtain the sworn version."

Indeed, some serious questions arise concerning some of the statements in the above article by Dr. Huggins. Since Dr. Huggins in no way qualifies his reference to the "40%", would not the average reader draw the conclusion that Dr. Huggins is saying that the Southern Convention actually receives 40% of N. C. Cooperative Program receipts? However, when we consider this in the light of what has been reported as received for the Cooperative Program for the first six months of this year, it is apparent that the Southern Convention has *not* received 40% of N. C. Cooperative Program money. As was stated above, Mr. Porter Routh reported that N. C. Baptists' gifts to the S. B. C. by way of the Cooperative Program were \$439,103 for the

first six months of this year. Now according to Controller Leon Spencer's report at the recent meeting of the General Board of the N. C. Convention, total receipts for the Cooperative Program during the first six months of this year amounted to \$1,399,111.73 (*Biblical Recorder*, August 3). It does not take much figuring to see that \$439,103 is not 40% of \$1,399,111. 40% of \$1,399,111 would be \$559,644. What was actually sent by N. C. Baptists to the Southern Convention was \$120,000 less than this!

It might be argued that Dr. Huggins, in writing to cooperating Baptists, would take it for granted that his figure of "40%" would be taken in the sense in which it is used in the budget as printed in the 1956 State Convention *Annual* (p. 105). According to this budget, the Southern Convention is to be given 40% of Cooperative Program receipts after the sum of \$360,000 has been whittled away from the funds to take care of certain "general items" (such as aiding the *Biblical Recorder*, etc.). Instead of 40% of the total Cooperative Program receipts going to the Southern Convention, the amount actually appropriated by the budget for this purpose is approximately 34½%.

But, even if Dr. Huggins is using "40%" in this reduced sense of amounting only to 34½%, the confusion is by no means cleared up. If 34½% of the \$1,399,111 was actually sent to the Southern Convention in the first six months of this year, then approximately \$482,692 should have been sent. Instead, Mr. Porter Routh only reported \$439,103. Thus, even if we are to understand "40%" in the reduced sense of meaning only 34½%, N. C. Cooperative Program gifts to the Southern Convention would be some \$43,589 short. The amount actually sent to the Southern Convention represents only about 31⅓ per cent of the total Cooperative Program receipts for the first six months of this year. It would seem, therefore, that Dr. Huggins' "40%" must be understood in the further reduced sense of meaning only a little over 31%. But if figures can fluctuate like this, what assurance do we have that the Southern Convention will receive even as much as 31% during the latter part of the year? Is there any reason why the "40%" might not come to mean "25%" or even "20%"?

But this is not all. Dr. Huggins argues that, at the rate at which N. C. Baptists are now giving, their Cooperative Program gifts to the Southern Convention for the whole year will be "some 10% more than in 1956." His

argument is that, because the Southern Convention "is receiving 40% straight through the year", then for the last few months of the year this "40%" will so exceed the "25%" which formerly was given to the Southern Convention in the closing months of the year, that the total for the whole year will actually exceed that of last year. Following Dr. Huggins' procedure of arguing on the basis of what N. C. Baptists have been doing for the first six months of the year, however, it is difficult to see how such a conclusion can be reached. If we take the first six months as determining what shall be done during the last six months, then it is obvious that, with the percentage sent to the Southern Convention being the same (the same "40%"!), the Southern Convention will be sent during the last six months just what it was sent during the first six—namely, \$439,103. This number doubled would be \$878,406, which would represent the total N. C. Baptist Cooperative Program gifts to the Southern Convention for 1957. But as we understand the 1956 N. C. *Annual*, N. C. Cooperative Program gifts to the Southern Convention last year amounted to \$959,609—or \$78,403 more than N. C. Baptists will give for 1957 at the rate at which they have been moving. Dr. Huggins' argument seems to be this: **at the rate that we are running behind we will finally start running ahead!** But the opposite would seem to be the case. According to Porter Routh's report, N. C. Cooperative Program gifts for the first six months of this



"At the Rate You're Losing You'll Finally Win"

year are running some \$72,220 behind the first six months of last year. But, as just pointed out, N. C. gifts to the Southern Convention, at the present rate, for the whole year will be *more* than \$72,220 behind what they were last year: they will be \$78,406 behind. It would seem, then, that at the rate that we are running behind we will wind up even farther behind!

It should be evident that, on the basis of the information now available to us, things seem to be very much confused. In view of this situation, *would it not be well for N. C. Baptists to be given a detailed audit of the books of the N. C. State Convention?* Readers of the June issue of this paper will remember that it was pointed out that the financial records are given a mere "balance-sheet" audit and not a "detailed audit." In fact, in view of certain conflicting information which we have been given, it seems that there is—even among the officials of the State Convention—uncertainty as to just how certain of the Cooperative Program funds are being expended. The Rev. **Woodrow Bullard**, former president of the general board, has stated in a letter that, "so far as I am able to determine from the minutes of the board and from the expenditures of the convention, no amount has been paid to any group in connection with this (the North Rocky Mount—J. M. B.) case." Yet, as was brought out in the July issue of this paper, Dr. **J. C. Canipe**, president of the State Convention, has been reported as admitting that Cooperative Program funds were used to pay Dr. W. W. Barnes' expenses in connection with that case.

In view of such apparently conflicting information both as to how much money has been received and as to how some of the money has been spent, how can we have reliable information as to just what are the facts, in the absence of a detailed audit of the financial records?

(J. M. B.)

JUST BEFORE GOING TO PRESS we received the following information from the Aug. 17 issue of the *Biblical Recorder*:

"North Carolina is credited with having given a total of \$71,515.78 to Southern Baptist causes during July. Of this amount

\$59,333.35 was given through the Cooperative Program, and \$12,184.43 was designated."

With just a little figuring it will be seen that the amount given to the Southern Convention by N. C. Baptists through the Cooperative Program in July is considerably *less* than even the monthly average for the first six months of the year. For the first six months, as has already been seen, N. C. Baptists gave \$439,103 through the Cooperative Program. The monthly average for this six month period would be \$73,117. But for the *seventh* month, July, only \$59,333.35 was given, and that is some \$13,783 less than the average month for the first half of the year. It looks more and more therefore, that, at the rate at which N. C. Baptists are running behind, they are going to wind up even farther behind.



JEW IN INDIA?

Assuredly — and they need Christ. And so we have entered that field.

AND IN MOROCCO?

The thousands of Hebrew-French bi-lingual New Testaments shipped to that land are fast running out, and the plea is for more.

AND WHAT OF EUROPE?

The financial assistance we have rendered to several mission boards has enabled them to open new fields in many lands.

We ask your special prayers for our missionaries in Israel, South Africa, Mexico and other countries facing opportunities without precedent.

We are thankful for the steadily increasing interest of Christian friends in this far-flung ministry.



Dr. Jacob Gartenhaus

For a free copy of our magazine, THE EVERLASTING NATION, Write Dept.

Dr. Jacob Gartenhaus, President
Dr. Robt. G. Lee, Ph.D., Chairman, Advisory Board

IBJM INTERNATIONAL BOARD OF
JEWISH MISSIONS, INC.
Box 1256 Atlanta 1, Ga.

ROGERS REFLECTIONS

(By I. W. Rogers, Associate Editor,

3511 Clinton Road, Paducah, Ky.)

"Never had it so good." The unionizers of the Southern Baptist Convention never had it so good, what with the presidents of the two conventions, Southern Baptist and American (Northern) Baptist, attending the same church in Washington, one as teacher in the Sunday School and the other as pastor, and with the two having the opportunity of sitting down together often and making plans for uniting the two conventions, and thus landing the Southern Convention into the lap of the National Council of Churches. But our state Baptist papers, some of them, at least, keep saying that the Southern Baptist Convention cannot join the National Council of Churches. In answer to this I quote from an editorial by Dr. E. P. Alldredge which was published in the April, 1951, issue of *The Faith and Southern Baptists*:

Neither the churches nor the associations nor the state conventions have any power over the Southern Baptist Convention. And, if our convention, or the majority of its messengers, desire to do so, it can vote at its next meeting to join both the National Council and the World Council of churches. And, none of our churches, associations, or state conventions could set aside such a vote! In fact, this is precisely what happened in the Northern Baptist Convention, in the Disciples Convention, in the National Synod of the Congregational Churches, and in half a dozen other denominations which joined the Federal Council. For, although all these denominations had congregational government; and the actions of the National Conventions could not bind any of the local churches in any of these bodies; nevertheless most of the churches followed their pastors and their conventions and went into the Federal Council and World Council. And, if a given meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention should vote overwhelmingly to enter the National Council of Churches, most of our Southern Baptist churches would ratify this action! For, most of our church members are being kept in utter ignorance of what is involved in the unionizing movement. And, most of the state Baptist papers would go right along and either praise such an action, or else keep as mum as a graveyard!

But, since Dr. Alldredge wrote the above, conditions have changed very much in favor of the unionizers. For instance, in North Carolina, where the highest court has in effect said that churches are part of a General Church, what can the churches do except go along with any action of the Southern Baptist Convention, or else jeopardize their church property?

Moody and Brunner. A large per cent of Southern Baptists still refuse to believe that the seminaries of the Southern Baptist Convention have gone over to Neo Orthodox teachings. I have a letter which shows how one of the two chief exponents of Neo Orthodoxy was received at one of our seminaries, and am quoting from it:

I attended the Training School and the Louisville Seminary in 1946-47. Dr. Brunner (Emil Brunner—I. W. R.) visited the campus and was introduced by Dale Moody in such a flowery manner that Brunner actually blushed. He (Brunner) was invited to speak for almost a week at the nearby Crescent Hill Baptist church. I attended these services and also some discussion groups, or forums, or what have you, in the seminary chapel. I heard him with my own ears deny the virgin birth of Christ, saying that he had never found anything in the Gospels to substantiate such a belief. As far as I know no one objected. I would now, but then I was too timid and easily led by "the powers that be" in the Convention. To me, it is just as bad to condone such a teaching as it is to get up in class and openly teach it. I haven't recovered from the shock yet.

I attended the seminary at New Orleans one semester the next year. It is no better. I did (not) take New Testament, and consequently did not study under Dr. Staggs . . . I have been fully aware of modernism in other church groups for years. Southern Baptists seem to take the attitude that even if there be modernism in its ranks, we shouldn't dare even whisper it about—even to an unsuspecting Baptist! I don't understand this attitude.

Dr. Robert J. McCracken, successor to Harry Emerson Fosdick, the notorious infidel-pastor-emeritus of the Riverside church, New York City, has been chosen to preach the 1958 convention sermon of the American (Northern) Baptist Convention. And this is the convention that Representative Brooks Hayes, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, seems to be trying to combine with the Southern Baptist Convention. McCracken seems to be entirely acceptable to Fosdick.

The equivalent of 33 cents out of every dollar the people of the United States earn now goes for taxes of some kind. We owe so much money that it takes ten per cent of our taxes to pay the interest!

Shameful! During the past nine years total receipts of Southern Baptist churches have increased 160 per cent. But the percentage of this total given to missions and other objects outside the local church, during the same period, has decreased 2.2 per cent! Why? I do not know all the reasons, but I am sure that much of it is due to the fact that when we cooperate with the Cooperative Program we cooperate with the devil, and conscientious church members do not like to cooperate with the devil! According to the present level of Southern Baptist giving to missions, it takes approximately 8,000 Baptists to support one missionary! Another reason for this is the bossism of Southern Baptist officials who are trying to force the church to give through the Cooperative Program. Every Baptist who still believes in the liberty of the individual soul and of the churches to take orders from no one except the Holy Spirit and the Head of the Church, deeply resent being dictated to by Baptist headquarters.

From an Illinois reader: "A new church was organized here last October 1, which was to be independent; then later (I think under pressure) it decided to go all out Southern Baptist. But after the pastor and one member went to the state Baptist Headquarters, they got their eyes opened on the Program; and when they told the church, they decided they did not want to be linked up with them."

"Gone to hold a meeting." Dr. L. R. Scarborough was one of the truly great soul-winners. Much of his time, even while he was president of Southwestern Seminary, was spent in revival meetings. He had six children. One

day some of them were playing with toy elephants. One of them said, "This is the mamma elephant and this is the baby elephant." Another said, "Where is the papa elephant?" The answer was, "He is gone off to hold a meeting."

Balky Baptists. In North Carolina there is a striking example of how liberty-loving Baptists will react to dictation. Our readers will remember that the denominational leaders in that state, along with help from Southern Baptist Convention leaders, succeeded in getting the Supreme Court of that state in effect to "force" N. C. Baptists to support the Cooperative Program. What has been the result? During the first six months of this calendar year N. C. Baptist contributions to the Southern Baptist Convention objects by designated gifts increased by \$85,856.80, and Cooperative Program gifts decreased by \$72,219.98, compared with the same period in 1956. And the end is not yet. But, thank God, love of liberty among Baptists is not dead!

Some people have read so much about the harmful effects of smoking that they have decided to give up reading. (END)

Where Have They Been?

The question is asked in the June 21 issue of the *Baptist Bible Tribune*, "Where have the great 'conservative stalwarts' been" all the time the autonomy issue has been facing Southern Baptists? "Where has Dr. Robert G. Lee been? Where has Dr. W. A. Criswell been? Where has Dr. Perry Webb been? Where has

BAPTIST MID-MISSIONS

**A WORLD WIDE BAPTIST MISSION AGENCY WITH A LOCAL
CHURCH-CENTERED PROGRAM**

Workers Serving in Africa, South America, Central America, The West Indies, India, Indonesia, Japan, Europe, Alaska, Canada, Hawaiian Islands and The United States. 580 Missionaries in all. Literature sent upon request.

SOUTHERN OFFICE

1935 Gaston Street

Winston-Salem, N. C.

MILTON D. ARNOLD, Deputation Secretary

Dr. W. R. White been?"

That paper gives the following answer:

"The answer is easy to anybody who knows the records of these men. They have been right where they have always been; in a comfortable chair, under a soft lamp, before an imposing desk, writing sermons on the Christian martyrs who chose principle above ecclesiastical and popular esteem. None can preach greater sermons on that theme than these men. Dr. Criswell might be a little better on a sermon on Modernists — dead Modernists. Dr. White might be a little better on a sermon on ecclesiastical tyranny — in the Middle Ages. Perry Webb can go to town on anything, whether it's round or square. As for Dr. Lee, we'll leave him with his words and his conscience.

"It's a sorry tale. Like plague, it is doing something to the minds and spirits of thousands of people in this country."

BOOK REVIEWS

The "VISUAL AIDS" Bible. King James Version, Wm. Collins Sons and Co., \$3.00.

This Bible is different from anything this reviewer has seen. It has more than 500 illustrations and maps placed right in the exact places where they are needed to make clear the message contained in the Scriptures. There are no pictures of individual Bible characters, but the illustrations are of things mentioned in the Bible. Another very helpful feature is the subject headings and sub-headings. The chapter and verse numbers are in the margins, and the text of the Scriptures is in paragraph form. The type is clear and easily read, and the binding is beautiful blue buckram. It is rather remarkable, in this time of high prices, that the book of over 1000 pages with all these illustrations in this excellent binding is being sold for \$3.00.

(I. W. R.)

139 Sermon Outlines. By W. Robertson Nicoll, Baker Book House, \$2.95.

These sermon outlines are all on the Old Testament, and are really condensed sermons — different in form from most sermon outlines. They were preached by some 46 outstanding ministers. For those who like to preach on the Old Testament, this book is worthy of serious consideration.

(I. W. R.)

Daniel. By H. A. Ironside, Loizeaux Brothers, \$2.50.

The Book of Daniel presents some very difficult problems to the average reader, and to the Bible scholar. As in all of Dr. Ironside's writings, he is so clear in his interpretation that no one need have any doubt as to his meaning. The reader may not agree with all his views, but he will find this book to be a helpful study of the Book of Daniel.

(I. W. R.)

Sex Without Fear. By S. A. Lewin, M.D., and John Gilmore, Ph.D., Medical Research Press, \$3.00.

Here are presented the facts about sex in clear and chaste language. But, in our opinion, the book should be read by married people only.

(I. W. R.)

Once Saved, Always Safe. By John L. Bray (privately published by the author, address: 503 Hagins St., Rock Hill, S. C.), .20¢.

This little booklet of 32 pages gives a discussion of the Scriptural teaching on eternal security in such a manner as should prove helpful to many who are seeking light on this subject. The author is not only concerned to establish the Scriptural basis for the security of the believer, but is also concerned to show that this doctrine, properly understood, leads to holiness in living.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the booklet would be far more useful if the author had undertaken to examine some of the passages of Scripture which are commonly taken to teach contrary to the doctrine of the believer's security. The author merely mentions the fact that there are such passages and assures the reader that such passages, if carefully examined, do not really contradict the doctrine of once saved always saved. It would have been better had the reader been given at least a sample of how such passages can be interpreted in accordance with the doctrine of security.

(J. M. B.)

(Not in stock at Faith Book House. Unless otherwise specified, all books reviewed in this column are for sale at the Faith Book House, 3511 Clinton Road, Paducah, Ky.)